REMARKS

Claims 1-43 are pending. Claims 1, 16, 22, 36 and 39, the independent claims, have been amended.

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite. With regard to the objection set forth in the first paragraph of page 2 of the Office Action, that objection is without merit, as there was nothing unclear about the scope of the independent claims prior to the present Amendment. However, to expedited prosecution, and without conceding the propriety of the rejection, several of the independent claims have been amended to even more clearly recite the claimed invention. The claims are believed clearly to meet the requirements of Section 112 rejection and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 5,195,031 (Ordish) in view of the Stock article. Applicants submit that independent claims are patentable over the prior art for at least the following reasons.

Ordish relates to a video communications trading system network, which includes a parser for parsing conversations between keystations, for the generation of deal tickets. The parser parses packets of text (the size of a packet is not specified) and "prunes" away text unrelated to the *type* of deal (e.g., spot, outright, swap/forward etc.) before the remaining text is re-examined. Ordish's parser parses conversation for as long as the conversation continues.

In Ordish, if a conversation relating to a *different type of deal* is input, the parser begins "pruning" the conversation in relation to the new type of deal from that point onwards. Col. 9, line 47 to col. 10, line 14. Ordish does not teach or suggest parsing to detect changes in or intended changes in *deal status*, as required by the claims.

Deal status refers to the progress of the deal from the initial request for a quote (RFQ) to deal competition through a number of intermediate stages. The Ordish process does not break deals down in this way, and certainly does not do so in relation to how parsing is performed. This

13

difference is made even more clear in the amended independent claims, which recite that each deal has a plurality of statuses after initiation and before completion of the deal.

Whereas Ordish modifies the parsing when a new *type* of deal is detected, it does not do so based on detection of a new status, or intention to change the deal status. The Office Action also appears to cite Ordish at col. 8, lines 41-42 as allegedly teaching detection of a change in deal status. However, this portion only refers to notifying a key station of a change *to the analysis*, not to any status of a deal.

In Ordish, parsing is done the same way regardless of deal *status*. For at least this reason, the Office Action has failed to set forth even a prima facie case of obviousness.

As discussed above, Ordish does not detect deal status. It follows that it also cannot meet the feature of the independent claims by which the information looked for in parsing is determined in accordance with a current deal status. The position was taken in the Office Action that Stock discloses these features. This is incorrect.

In the first place, Stock is wholly irrelevant to the subject matter of the present invention. Stock is concerned with a system which integrates natural language processing with hypermedia to give a degree of selectivity in information returned to a user in response to questions. It is mainly concerned with providing information about works of art which are tailored according to the portion of a work of art to which the user is pointing, or has selected. At best, this could be considered to disclose a system which gives an output that is conditional on the input, but it does not relate to changing how conversation is parsed in accordance with a current deal status.

The Office Action specifically refers to Sections 4 and 5 of the paper. These deal with the detail of the parser detects changes in conversation to provide an interactive natural language based system for human computer interface which combines graphics and language. However, contrary to the position apparently being taken by the Examiner, Stock contains no teaching, or

14

remote suggestion, that would equate this with varying the behavior of the parser in accordance with the current deal status, as in the independent claims.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art of instrument trading systems would simply not have looked to Stock, which is directed to solving problems unrelated to those occurring in instrument trading systems, to remedy the admitted deficiency of Ordish as a reference. In any event, even when combined, there is no detection of deal status in the manner claimed in the amended independent claims, where each deal has a plurality of statuses after initiation and before completion of the deal.

In view of the above, it is submitted that no prima facie case of obviousness has been set forth as against amended independent claims 1, 16, 22, 36 and 39, which are believed patentable over the cited prior art.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Dated: June 21, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

By *Joseph W. Ragusa*
Joseph W. Ragusa
    Registration No.: 38,586
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
41st Floor
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant